

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

1. STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel.)
W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his capacity as)
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF)
OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA SECRETARY)
OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
in his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL)
RESOURCES FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

) 05-CV-0329 JOE-SAJ

1. TYSON FOODS, INC.,)
2. TYSON POULTRY, INC.,)
3. TYSON CHICKEN, INC.,)
4. COBB-VANTRESS, INC.,)
5. AVIAGEN, INC.,)
6. CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.,)
7. CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.,)
8. CARGILL, INC.,)
9. CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)
10. GEORGE'S, INC.,)
11. GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.,)
12. PETERSON FARMS, INC.,)
13. SIMMONS FOODS, INC., and)
14. WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,)

Defendants.)

CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)

Third Party Plaintiff,)

v.)

CITY OF TAHLEQUAH; CITY OF WESTVILLE,)

Third Party Defendants.)

THIRD PARTY COMPLAINT

I. BACKGROUND

Defendant/Third Party Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC (referred to hereinafter as “Third Party Plaintiff”), having denied all liability to the State of Oklahoma, *ex rel.* W.A. Drew Edmondson, in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, C. Miles Tolbert, in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma (“Plaintiffs”), hereby set forth its third-party claims pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 14(a).

1. As specified in further detail below, Third Party Plaintiff’s claims stated herein are prompted by and based upon the allegations contained in the Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (“Complaint”), which are incorporated by reference as though fully restated herein. In their Complaint, Plaintiffs assert that Third Party Plaintiff caused injury to the Illinois River Watershed (“IRW”),¹ including the biota, lands, water and sediments therein as a consequence of the practice of land applying poultry litter. Plaintiffs assert that the use of poultry litter in agricultural operations has resulted in the release and disposal of “hazardous materials,” “hazardous wastes,” and “solid wastes” as those terms are defined by federal statute. Plaintiffs attribute their claimed injury to the release of nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen, as well as five additional constituents set forth in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint. Plaintiffs purport to state ten counts against Third Party Plaintiff, including claims for cost recovery under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a); natural resource damages under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(f); injunctive relief under the Citizen Suit provision of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, (“SWDA”), 42 U.S.C. § 6972; public and private nuisance and nuisance *per se* under Oklahoma law and federal

¹ Complaint at ¶ 22.

common-law; trespass under Oklahoma law; violations of Oklahoma statutes and regulations, namely 27A O.S. § 2-6-105, 2 O.S. § 2-18.1, 2 O.S. § 10-9.7, OAC §35:17-5-5, and OAC § 35:17-3-14; and unjust enrichment, and restitution and disgorgement under Oklahoma law. Plaintiffs are purporting to recover past and future damages, restitution, environmental assessment, remediation, punitive damages, temporary and permanent injunctive relief, attorney's fees and costs.

2. Third Party Plaintiff denies that its conduct and that of the contract poultry farmers is anything other than lawful, prudent, agricultural activity that has been officially sanctioned by the Legislatures of the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas. By virtue of the broadly cast allegations of the Complaint, it is clear that Plaintiffs are asserting that any conduct within the IRW which results in the release of phosphates or phosphorus-containing compounds (hereinafter referred to collectively as "phosphorus"), nitrogen or any of the other listed constituents is unlawful activity, which gives rise to liability to Plaintiffs for damages and injunctive relief. As such, in light of Plaintiffs' stated intention to hold Third Party Plaintiff jointly and severally liable for the entirety of the alleged injury claimed to exist in the IRW, the Third Party Plaintiff Cargill Turkey Production, LLC is entitled and compelled to bring third-party claims against other persons and entities who conduct activities within the IRW that release phosphorus, nitrogen or any other purportedly harmful constituent into the IRW. Should the Plaintiffs prevail on their claims and theories, thereby holding Third Party Plaintiff liable to any extent, the following Third Party Defendants should be liable in the same manner to the extent of their several share of liability under the theory of contribution, or in the alternative indemnity. Accordingly, Third Party Plaintiff sets forth the following allegations based upon its knowledge, information and/or belief.

3. Any contributions from poultry litter applications by Third Party Plaintiff or the poultry farmers with whom they contract to the overall loading of phosphorus, nitrogen or any other purportedly harmful constituent in the IRW (which contribution is denied) would be insignificant in comparison to the contributions of Third Party Defendants and the thousands of other persons, corporations and political subdivisions operating in the IRW.

4. Numerous Municipal Publicly Operated Treatment Works (“POTWs”) discharge directly into the tributaries in the IRW wastewater containing some or all of the same constituents identified in the Complaint. The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (“ODEQ”) has estimated that these POTWs, standing alone, account for over approximately one-third of the total observed phosphorus load in the IRW. No POTWs were joined by the Plaintiffs in the Complaint.

II. PARTIES

Third Party Plaintiff

5. Third Party Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, is a corporation under the laws of Delaware, and has its principal place of business in Kansas.

III. Third Party Defendants

6. Third Party Defendant, the City of Tahlequah, is a municipal corporation in the State of Oklahoma, which discharges treated sewage and/or wastewater pursuant to NPDES permit no. OK0026964, and has allowed the disposal of sewage sludge from its treatment plants into the IRW, which include but are not limited to the constituents alleged to have been discharged into the IRW in the Complaint. Upon information and belief, the City of Tahlequah has also engaged in the practice of applying fertilizers and pesticides to properties of the City of Tahlequah within the IRW. Upon information and belief, City of Tahlequah systematically

applies fertilizers and other chemicals to its lands and easements located within the IRW. Tahlequah City Golf Course also has sewage lagoons which receive a portion of the runoff from the fairways. These activities are on-going and continuous. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of Third Party Plaintiff gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then the City of Tahlequah's conduct and operations, which results in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to Third Party Plaintiff under the theories of contribution and/or indemnity.

7. Third Party Defendant, the City of Westville, is a municipal corporation in the State of Oklahoma, which discharges treated sewage and/or wastewater pursuant to NPDES permit no. OK0028126, and has allowed the disposal of sewage sludge from its treatment plants into the IRW. Upon information and belief, the City of Westville has also engaged in the practice of applying fertilizers and pesticides to properties of the City of Westville within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of Third Party Plaintiff gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then the City of Westville's conduct and operations, which results in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to Third Party Plaintiffs under the theories of contribution and/or indemnity.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims set forth herein to the extent that the Court has jurisdiction over the claims and parties identified in the Complaint. The damages claimed by the Plaintiffs in the Complaint are alleged to have been caused by Third Party Plaintiff's activities within the Illinois River Watershed as defined by the Plaintiffs in paragraphs no. 22-23 of the Complaint. Third Party Plaintiff likewise asserts that the acts and omissions of the Third Party Defendants occurred within the State of Oklahoma. Moreover, Plaintiffs have alleged claims under CERCLA and SWDA seeking abatement, assessment damages, remediation, damages for loss value and restoration of the natural resource, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 42 U.S.C. § 9613 (b) and 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a). Additionally, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over this matter and any claims for contribution from other potential responsible parties under CERCLA and SWDA, and state law claims for contribution and indemnification pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

9. Personal jurisdiction is properly exercised over Third Party Defendants because the activities engaged in by Third Party Defendants are occurring or have occurred on property located within the State of Oklahoma. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e), (k).

V. STATEMENTS OF FACT

A. The Underlying Lawsuit

10. Plaintiffs filed their Complaint against Third Party Plaintiffs on June 13, 2005. On August 18, 2005, Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint against Third Party Plaintiff, a copy of which is attached hereto as Ex. "1."

11. Plaintiffs purport to bring their claims as “Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma and...Trustee for Natural Resources of the State of Oklahoma....” (Am. Cmplt. pg. 1).

12. Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff’s operations in the IRW have “caused injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny.

13. Plaintiffs allege the “1,069,530-acre Illinois River Watershed (“IRW”) straddles the Oklahoma-Arkansas border. The approximately 576,030 acres of the IRW that are located in Oklahoma include portions of Delaware, Adair, Cherokee and Sequoyah counties...as well as its major tributaries, the Baron (a/k/a Barren) Fork River, the Caney Creek and the Flint Creek.” (Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 22, 23).

14. Plaintiffs allege the “Illinois River feeds into the 12,900 acre Tenkiller Ferry Lake....” (Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 26).

15. Plaintiffs allege that “[i]n recent years these resources have been and are continuing to be polluted, degraded, and their uses have been and are continuing to be injured and impaired”, and that “[t]his pollution of and injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein, are indivisible,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 29, 30].

16. Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff “[is] responsible for this pollution of, as well as the degradation of, impairment of and injury to the IRW, including biota, lands, waters and sediments therein”, by virtue of its growers’ agriculture practices. Those alleged agriculture practices include the land application of poultry litter as a fertilizer “in excess of any agronomic need,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 31, 50]

17. Plaintiffs allege that any application of poultry litter in excess of agronomic need

“constitutes waste disposal rather than any normal or appropriate application of fertilizer,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 50].

18. Plaintiffs allege these alleged “waste disposal practices lead to run-off and release of large quantities of phosphorous and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants in the poultry waste onto and from the fields and into the waters of the IRW,” and “large quantities of phosphorous and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants to accumulate in soils,” which lead to continued and future run-off into the waters of the IRW, which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 52, 53]

19. Plaintiffs allege that poultry litter contains “a number of constituents that can and do cause harm to the environment and pose human health hazards.” The constituents alleged by Plaintiffs include:

- a. phosphorus/phosphorus compounds;
- b. nitrogen/nitrogen compounds;
- c. arsenic/arsenic compounds;
- d. zinc/zinc compounds;
- e. copper/copper compounds;
- f. hormones; and/or
- g. microbial pathogens.

20. Plaintiffs allege that “[t]he lands and waters in the IRW...contain elevated levels of a number of constituents.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 58, 59].

21. Plaintiffs assert that the nutrients and metal compounds listed above in Paragraph No. 19 are hazardous substances under CERCLA, which Third Party Plaintiff denies. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 61, 62].

22. Plaintiffs assert that “poultry waste is a solid and/or hazardous waste under the SWDA,” which Third Party Plaintiffs have denied and continue to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 92]

23. Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff “has in the past been or is now a generator of poultry waste and/or has in the past been or is now an owner or operator of a treatment, storage or disposal facility for poultry waste,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 93].

24. Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff is “a ‘person’ as defined by SWDA who has contributed to and/or is contributing to the past or present handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of poultry waste in the IRW...,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 94].

25. Plaintiffs allege that “[a]n imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment may be presented and is in fact presented as a direct and proximate result of ... [Third Party Plaintiff’s] ... contribution to the handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of poultry waste in the IRW...,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 95].

26. Plaintiffs claim that Third Party Plaintiff has “intentionally” created a private and public nuisance under both Oklahoma and Federal law “[a]s a result of [its] poultry waste disposal practices,” which include the “placement/contribution to the placement of poultry wastes where they are likely to cause pollution,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 99-104, 110-114].

27. Plaintiffs have also claimed that Third Party Plaintiff’s activities as alleged in the Complaint constitute “an actual and physical invasion of and interference with the State of

Oklahoma's property interests in the IRW...,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 120-122].

28. Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff has violated 27A O.S. § 2-6-105, 2 O.S. § 2-18.1 “by and through [its] wrongful poultry waste disposal practices...,” and thus, Plaintiffs state they are entitled to civil penalties for each respective violation pursuant to 27A O.S. § 2-3-504 and 2 O.S. § 2-16, which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 129-132].

29. Plaintiffs further allege that Third Party Plaintiff has violated the Animal Waste Management Plan criteria set forth in Oklahoma Administrative Code, § 35:17-3-14 by its “wrongful poultry waste disposal practices...,” and thus, Plaintiffs state they are entitled to civil penalties pursuant to 2 O.S. § 9-212, which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 138, 139].

30. Plaintiffs claim by engaging “in improper poultry waste disposal practices,” Third Party Plaintiff has “avoided the costs of properly managing and disposing of [its] poultry waste” to its economic benefit and at the expense of the Plaintiffs’ rights, and thus, Third Party Plaintiff has had a benefit conferred upon it by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs claim that this is an unjust enrichment and seek “disgorgement of all gains...realized in consequence of [its] wrongdoing,” which Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 141-147].

31. Pursuant to their claims, Plaintiffs are seeking all past monetary damages, future damages, permanent injunctive relief, declaratory judgment, restitution, exemplary damages, statutory penalties, pre-judgment interest, attorney’s fees and costs (including but not limited to court costs, expert and consultants costs, and litigation and investigative expenses). [Am. Cmplt. at Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1-8].

B. General Allegations Regarding Third Party Defendants

32. Third Party Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 31 as though fully set forth herein.

33. Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny all of the Plaintiffs' allegations of wrongdoing, and denies that it is responsible for or has contributed to any purported pollution in the IRW.

34. Third Party Plaintiff served Third Party Defendants, City of Tahlequah and City of Westville on May 2, 2005 and May 3, 2005, with its written notice of Third Party Plaintiff's claims against them based upon Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to the Oklahoma Governmental Tort Claims Act, 51 O.S. § 156 and under the Solid Waste Disposal Act ("SWDA"), by registered mail, properly addressed and postage prepaid to Third Party Defendants. [Notices, attached hereto as Ex. "2"].

35. Third Party Defendants, City of Tahlequah and City of Westville, failed to either approve or deny Third Party Plaintiff's claims within ninety (90) days of its submission; thus, Third Party Plaintiff's contribution and/or claims have been deemed denied pursuant to 51 O.S. § 157.

36. Third Party Defendants have and continue to engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW, more specifically identified in paragraphs 6 - 7, which include but are not limited to discharging sewage and wastewater, applying of organic and commercial fertilizer and chemicals, and engaging in other activities which result in the release of some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW as defined by Plaintiffs. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶58, 61-64].

37. To the extent the Court finds the natural resources of the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments have been adversely impacted as alleged by Plaintiffs in their Complaint, such adverse impacts have been caused or contributed to by the acts and omissions of Third Party Defendants which have resulted in the release of the same or similar constituents as those allegedly contained in poultry litter into the IRW, as set forth in paragraph 19, above.

38. As stated in their Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff, by applying poultry litter as a fertilizer to the lands within the IRW, have caused and are causing “an unreasonable invasion of, interference with, impairment to, inconvenience to, annoyance to and injury to the State of Oklahoma and the public’s beneficial use and enjoyment of the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 100, 111].

39. Although Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should Third Party Plaintiff be found liable to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs recover damages or injunctive relief pursuant to any of Plaintiffs’ claims for nuisance, trespass, unjust enrichment, or violations of 27A O.S. § 2-6-105 and 2 O.S. § 2-18.1, and OAC § 35:17-3-14, Third Party Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to contribution pursuant to 12 O.S. § 832 and/or indemnification from Third Party Defendants based upon their operations and/or activities within the IRW.

40. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that “[t]he IRW, including the lands, waters and sediments therein, constitutes a ‘site or area where a hazardous substance...has been deposited, stored, disposed of, or place, otherwise come to be located;’ and, as such, constitutes a ‘facility’ within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9).” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 72, 81].

41. While Third Party Plaintiff denies and continues to deny the allegations of wrongdoing contained within the Complaint, Third Party Plaintiff states that should the Court

find that the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein constitute a “facility” under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9), then the IRW is also a “facility” as to the Third Party Defendants’ operations and/or activities within the IRW.

42. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff “is a ‘person,’ and thus, a potentially responsible party within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(21).” If the Court finds that Third Party Plaintiff, based upon the activities of their independent growers, is a “person” within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(21), then Third Party Defendants are also “persons” under CERCLA in that they, individually and collectively, engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW that have and continue to result in the release of phosphorous and some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW.

43. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff is covered within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a), in that it “[has] arranged for disposal of [its] poultry waste which contains hazardous substances...which has been released to and within the IRW...,” and that they “individually and collectively, have been owners and/or operators during the time their poultry waste containing these hazardous substances was generated and disposed of and released into the IRW...” If the Court finds that Third Party Plaintiff is a potentially responsible party under CERCLA, 42 U.S. § 9607(a), then Third Party Defendants are also potentially responsible parties under CERCLA in that they, individually or collectively, engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW that have and continue to result in the release of phosphorous and some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 74, 75, 83 and 84].

44. Plaintiffs allege in the Complaint that by and through Third Party Plaintiff's activities and operations, "hazardous substances" within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(14)...were disposed of in the IRW, including the lands, waters and sediments therein, resulting in 'releases' and/or 'threatened releases' of hazardous substances within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 (22)." In the event, the Court finds that poultry litter as outlined in Plaintiffs' Complaint at paragraphs no. 79 and 80, is a "hazardous substance" within the meaning of CERCLA, then Third Party Defendants' activities and/or operations within the IRW which result in the release or threatened release of some or all of the same constituents as poultry litter would, likewise, be considered a release of a "hazardous substance" under CERCLA into the IRW. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 72, 80].

45. While continuing to deny the allegations of wrongdoing in the Complaint, in the event that Third Party Plaintiff is found liable under Plaintiffs' CERCLA cost recovery claims for the alleged release of "hazardous substances," then Third Party Defendants should, likewise, be liable for their activities and/or operations within the IRW which result in the release of the same alleged "hazardous substances" into the IRW.

46. Although Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should Third Party Plaintiff be found liable under CERCLA § 107 for Plaintiffs' cost recovery claims, and be ordered to pay response costs, which include, but are not limited to costs of monitoring, assessing and evaluation of the waters, wildlife and biota in the IRW, to the Plaintiffs, then Third Party Plaintiff is entitled to contribution pursuant to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) from Third Party Defendants because their activities and/or operations within the IRW have resulted in the release of some, if not all of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as "hazardous substances." Thus, as a result of

their conduct, if Third Party Plaintiff is required to pay any damages to Plaintiffs, then Third Party Defendants should be required to pay for their respective shares of any response costs adjudged against Third Party Plaintiff.

47. Although Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should Third Party Plaintiff be found liable to Plaintiffs under CERCLA, and a declaratory judgment be entered holding Third Party Plaintiff liable for all future necessary responses costs, then Third Party Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment from Third Party Defendants holding them similarly liable for their respective shares of any future response costs due to their activities and/or operations within the IRW, which have resulted in the release of some, if not all, of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as “hazardous substances.” Furthermore, if Third Party Plaintiff is required to pay any future necessary response costs pursuant to any declaratory judgment entered by the Court, then Third Party Defendants should, likewise, be required to pay for their respective shares of any future necessary response costs adjudged against the Third Party Plaintiff.

48. Plaintiffs also seek natural resource damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 9607. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that “[t]he Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, acting on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, is the designated CERCLA trustee for ‘natural resources’ in, belonging to, managed by, held in trust by, appertaining to or otherwise controlled by the State of Oklahoma,” and that as trustee, the Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment “shall assess damages to natural resources for purposes of CERCLA for those natural resources under their trusteeship.” [Am. Cmpl. at ¶ 79].

49. Plaintiffs claim that “[a]s a result of the release of hazardous substances...into the IRW...there has been injury to, destruction of, and loss of natural resources in the IRW,

including the land, fish, wildlife, biota, air, water, ground water, drinking water supplies and all other such resources therein....” According to Plaintiffs’ allegations, these alleged injuries are “continuing” in nature, and Plaintiffs have “incurred reasonable and necessary costs to assess and evaluate this injury and loss of natural resources.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 85-87].

50. For their alleged natural resource damages claim under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607 (a), Plaintiffs seek “(a) the cost to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of such natural resources; (b) the compensable value of lost services resulting from the injury to such natural resources; and (c) the reasonable cost of assessing injury to the natural resources and the resulting damages.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 89].

51. While continuing to deny the allegations of wrongdoing in the Complaint, in the event that Third Party Plaintiff is found liable under Plaintiffs’ CERCLA § 107 natural resource damages claim for the alleged release of “hazardous substances,” then Third Party Defendants should, likewise, be liable for their activities and/or operations within the IRW which resulted in the release of the same alleged “hazardous substances” into the IRW.

52. Although Third Party Plaintiff has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should Third Party Plaintiff be found liable under CERCLA § 107, and be ordered to pay natural resource damages to Plaintiffs, which could include, but not be limited to “(a) the cost to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of such natural resources; (b) the compensable value of lost services resulting from the injury to such natural resources; and (c) the reasonable cost of assessing injury to the natural resources and the resulting damages,” then Third Party Plaintiff is entitled to contribution pursuant to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) from Third Party Defendants for their respective share of those damages because their activities and/or operations within the IRW have resulted in the release of some, if

not all, of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as “hazardous substances” for their respective share of those damages.

53. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Third Party Plaintiff is responsible for the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste” that presents “an imminent and substantial endangerment to health and the environment in the IRW.” Plaintiffs' allegations are that the application of poultry litter as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner by Third Party Plaintiff's growers and other third parties to the lands within the IRW, presents an imminent and substantial endangerment to health and the environment. [Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 92-96].

54. Upon information and belief, Third Party Defendants are responsible for their past and present activities and operations in the IRW, which has resulted in the release of some or all of the same constituents allegedly contained in poultry litter into the IRW. Therefore, if the Court finds that the application of poultry litter and its constituents as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner to lands within the IRW constitutes the release of “a solid and/or hazardous waste under SWDA,” then the past and present conduct and activities of Third Party Defendants which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents as allegedly contained in poultry litter into the IRW would also constitute the release of “a solid and/or hazardous waste under SWDA.”

55. Furthermore, if the Court finds that the application of poultry litter as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner by Third Party Plaintiff's growers and other third party property owners constitutes the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste,” and further finds that Third Party Plaintiff has created an alleged imminent and substantial endangerment in the IRW under SWDA, then the Court must also find that Third Party Defendants' activities and/or operations as defined in paragraphs no. 6 - 7, above, which

result in the release of some or all of the same constituents Plaintiffs allege are contained within poultry litter into the IRW, also constitute the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste,” and therefore, Third Party Defendants must also be found liable for creating any alleged imminent and substantial endangerment in the IRW under SWDA.

56. Therefore, in the event the Court finds Third Party Plaintiff liable under SWDA, then Third Party Defendants must also be held liable under SWDA for their activities and operations within the IRW. Moreover, if the Court issues any injunctive relief whether it be temporary or permanent against Third Party Plaintiff, or requires it to engage in any clean-up, assessment or remediation efforts, Third Party Defendants should also be required to participate in any injunctive relief, clean-up, assessment or remediation efforts.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, in the event Plaintiffs should receive any judgment against Third Party Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, for damages for their alleged injuries, Third Party Plaintiff likewise demands judgment against the Third Party Defendants on each of the claims alleged, including but not limited to the following:

- (1) any injunctive relief granted against Third Party Plaintiff, including any relief which requires Third Party Plaintiff to remediate, abate any activity or condition, and/or pay any costs associated with assessing and quantifying the amount of remediation or natural resource damages;
- (2) any liability assessed for past monetary damages including all costs and expenses;
- (3) any declaratory relief granted by the Court against Third Party Plaintiff including any liability for future damages including all costs and expenses;
- (4) any restitution damages;

- (5) any punitive or exemplary damages;
- (6) any federal or state statutory penalties;
- (7) attorneys' fees and costs;
- (8) prejudgment interest; and
- (9) any further relief the Court deems just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ John H. Tucker

JOHN H. TUCKER, OBA #9110

COLIN H. TUCKER, OBA #16325

THERESA NOBLE HILL, OBA #19119

100 W. Fifth Street, Suite 400 (74103-4287)

P.O. Box 21100

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100

Telephone: 918/582-1173

Facsimile: 918/592-3390

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT CARGILL TURKEY
PRODUCTION LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the ____ day of October, 2005, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS:

W.A. Drew Edmondson, OBA #2628
drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us;
suzy_thrash@oag.state.ok.us
2300 North Lincoln Boulevard, Suite 112
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
and
M. David Riggs, OBA #7583
driggs@riggsabney.com
Richard T. Garren, OBA #3253
rgarren@riggsabney.com
Sharon K. Weaver, OBA #19010
sweaver@riggsabney.com
Douglas A. Wilson, OBA #13128
doug_wilson@riggsabney.com
Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis
502 W. 6th Street
P.O. Box 1046
Tulsa, OK 74101
and
Robert A. Nance, OBA #6581
rnance@ribbsabney.com
D. Sharon Gentry, OBA #15641
sgentry@riggsabney.com
Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis
5801 Broadway Extension, Suite 101
Oklahoma City, OK 73118
and
Louis W. Bullock, OBA #1305
lbullock@mkblaw.net
J. Randall Miller, OBA #6214
rmiller@mkblaw.net
David P. Page, OBA #6852
davidpage@mkblaw.net
Miller, Keffer & Bullock, PC
222 South Kenosha
Tulsa, OK 74120

COUNSEL FOR PETERSON FARMS, INC.:

A. Scott McDaniel, OBA #16460
smcdaniel@jpm-law.com
Chris A. Paul, OBA #14416
cpaul@jpm-law.com
Nicole M. Longwell, OBA #18771
nlongwell@jpm-law.com
Philip D. Hixon, OBA #19121
phixon@jpm-law.com
Martin A. Brown, OBA #18660
mbrown@jpm-law.com
Joyce, Paul & McDaniel, PC
1717 South Boulder Ave., Suite 200
Tulsa, OK 74119

**COUNSEL FOR TYSON FOODS, INC.; TYSON
POULTRY, INC.; TYSON CHICKEN, INC.;
AND COBB-VANTRESS, INC.:**

Patrick M. Ryan, OBA #7864
pryan@ryanwhaley.com
Stephen L. Jantzen, OBA #16247
sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com
Ryan, Whaley & Coldiron, PC
119 N. Robinson
900 Robinson Renaissance
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

**COUNSEL FOR WILLOW BROOK FOODS,
INC.:**

R. Thomas Lay, OBA #5297
Kerr, Irvine, Rhodes & Ables
201 Robert S. Kerr Ave., Suite 600
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
rtl@kiralaw.com

I also hereby certify that I served the attached document by United States Postal Service, proper postage paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

Elizabeth C. Ward
Frederick C. Baker
Motley Rice LLC
28 Bridgeside Blvd.
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

and

William H. Narwold
Motley Rice LLC
20 Church St., 17th Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

and

C. Miles Tolbert
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma
3800 North Classen
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

s/ John H. Tucker